Dear Phil,

7/5/84

Thanks for the time and trouble represented by your 7/2. I'm sorry if I did not make it clear that I wondered about official acknowledgement of electronic surveillance of the USSR in Mexico City.

There is a vast difference under FOIA between official and unofficial acknowledgements.

I'd been waiting to hear from Lesar before writing you and Paul further about this, and now I'm waiting to hear from him about what Bud thinks. Bud is or was out of town and Jim is behind schedule on a brief.

He is inclined to believe that a suit would be worthwhile, he = Jim.

The only reason I'd consider it is that I've already done all the work it would require of me in my appeals, those to DJ being well documented. The records, as Paul may recall, also are pertinent in my field offices suit.

I've also suggested to Jim that this is a good point for co-plaintiffs or something like it. I presume that this is within Paul's requests and I'm sure it is the subject of one of Mark Allen's. So I've suggested that they might want to be co-plaintiff's and if they'd prefer not, perhaps instead of suing for myself only, which I'm quite willing to do, I might so "and on behalf of" with names added. What I really have in mind is addressing the official mythology that there is no real interest. Which raises the question, do you want to join in?

The difference I grab onto now is the official admission, the CIA and DJ both being represented at the deposition, of the USSR surveillance and the subject of what Oswald said. Or, with these official admission, what can they reasonably claim tyey can now withhold?

I'll keep you and Paul posted.

Best regards,

His letter cites Summers Cpnspiracy, 373